

創価大学  
国際仏教学高等研究所  
年 報

平成27年度  
(第19号)

Annual Report  
of  
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2015

Volume XIX

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所  
東京・2016・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
Soka University  
Tokyo・2016

## Some Remarks on Technical Terms of Stūpa Architecture

Oskar von HINÜBER

Although much has been said on the symbolism of the Stūpa, less attention has been paid so far to a systematic investigation into the architectural terminology used to describe this type of building.<sup>1</sup> Thus, in a way, the second step was done before the first. Therefore, the following study tries to return to basics, to draw attention to some very few problems of this area of Indian architectural terminology and to make suggestions for tentative solutions.

The starting point is the technical term *puphagahani* found in the inscriptions at the Adhālaka Mahācetiya in Kanaganahalli and the corresponding Sanskrit terms *puṣṭagrahaṇī* together with *puṣṭagrahaṇīvedikā* occurring rarely in Buddhist texts.<sup>2</sup> In course of the investigation it turned out to be necessary to supplement the material gathered from Buddhist Sanskrit texts by evidence from Ceylon, particularly on the corresponding Pāli word *pupphādhāna* and on the meaning of *vedikā*.

Though closely related, the evidence from Sanskrit and Pāli texts is discussed separately. For, the material preserved in these two languages forms two units divided not only linguistically, but also geographically. Moreover, while the Pāli Theravāda texts refer to Stūpas built or repaired in Ceylon during periods that can be defined at least approximately, it is usually next to impossible to determine a geographical and chronological frame for the development of the Sanskrit material. Besides the relative dearth of evidence, this uncertainty poses a major problem when discussing the terminology of Stūpa architecture.

Because of all these adverse circumstances the results of the following attempts to determine the exact or, more modestly, approximate meaning and development of individual terms very often cannot but remain preliminary.

---

<sup>1</sup> Besides those quoted below, the following works deserve to be mentioned here: Adrian Snodgrass: *The Symbolism of the Stupa*. New York 1985 (repr. Delhi 1992) [rev.: H. Kottkamp, *OLZ* 83. 1988, pp. 517–525], Heino Kottkamp: *Der Stupa als Repräsentation des buddhistischen Heilsweges. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung architektonischer Symbolik*. Studies in Oriental Religions Volume 25. Wiesbaden 1992 [rev.: J. W. de Jong, *IJ* 38. 1995, pp. 192–196], and first of all the important criticism by Gérard Fussman, “Symbolism of the Buddhist Stūpa.” *JIAS* 9/2, 1986, pp. 37–53 = *Choix d’articles*. Paris 2014, 181–197. Further literature on the Stūpa is collected by Max Deeg, “Legend and Cult. Contributions to the History of Indian Buddhist Stūpas. Part 1: The “Stūpa of Kaniṣka.”” *Buddhist Studies Review* 21/1. 2004, pp. 1–34, particularly p. 1 notes 1–3. – The article by Gisbert Combaz, “L’évolution du Stūpa en Asie. Contributions nouvelles et vue d’ensemble.” *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*. 3. 1934–1935. Bruxelles 1935, pp. 93–144 is still a useful survey. Except for the images, it is impossible to benefit from Johannes W. Glauche: *Der Stupa. Kultbau des Buddhismus*. Köln 1995.

<sup>2</sup> It is my most pleasant obligation to thank Dr. Péter Szántó, Oxford, who kindly drew my attention to the references in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikāsūtra* and in the *Stūpalakṣaṇakārikāvivecana* during the discussion following the Lingyin Lecture on “Buddhist Texts and Buddhist Images. New Evidence from Kanaganahalli” held in Oxford on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2015.

## Part I: Puṣṭhagrahaṇī

The oldest literary evidence for *puṣṭhagrahaṇī*(*vedikā*) is found in the *Stūpasamdarśana-parivarta*, the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of the Gilgit-Nepalese version of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, which begins as follows:

*atha khalu bhagavataḥ purastāt tataḥ prthivīpradeśāt parśanmadhyāt saptaratnamayaḥ stūpo 'bhyudgataḥ pañcayojanaśatāny uccaistvena tadanurūpeṇa ca pariṇāheṇa. abhyudgamyā vaihāyasāntarīkṣe samavātiṣṭhac citro darśanīyaḥ pañcabhiḥ puṣṭhagrahaṇīvedikāśahasraiḥ<sup>3</sup> svalaṃkṛto bahutorāṇasahasraiḥ pratimaṇḍitaḥ patākāvaijayantīśahasrābhiḥ pralambito ratnadāmasahasrābhiḥ pralambitaḥ paṭṭaghaṇṭāsahasrapralambitas ... chatrāvālī ... samucchrītā, SP (ed. H. Kern) 239,1-6.*

The corresponding wording in the Khotan (ex Kashgar) manuscript is slightly different:<sup>4</sup>

*atha khalu bhagavataḥ purastāt tataḥ prthivīpradeśāt saptaratnamayaṃ stūpaṃ abhyujjagāma : bhagavataḥ pariśanmaṇḍalamadhye pañcayojanaśatāny uccatvena tadānu-pūrvapariṇāhenābhyudgantvā ca vaihāyasy antarīkṣe 'sthāsīt citraṃ sudarśanīyaṃ śobhati bhāsati tapati virocati: puṣṭhagrahaṇīvedikāśahasrebhi svalaṃkṛtaṃ bahutorāṇasatasahasra-supratimaṇḍitaṃ patākāvejayaṃtīśatasahasrebhir alaṃkṛtaṃ ratnadāmaśatasahasrebhir avasiktebhi. paṭudāma-śatasahasrebhiḥ pralambamānebhiḥ ghaṇvāgatasāhasrābhi<sup>5</sup> raṇantībhi ... chatrāvālī (sic) ..., SP (Khotan ed. H. Toda) 117,1-11.*

As the word *puṣṭhagrahaṇī* stands isolated in this enumeration, it is, of course, impossible to guess its exact meaning from the context.

Therefore, ancient<sup>6</sup> and modern translators alike were and are (necessarily) more or less helpless: Eugène Burnouf: *Le lotus de la bonne loi*. Paris 1852, p. 145, relies on the Tibetan translation and translates “balcons jonchés de fleurs,” H. Kern: *The Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka or The Lotus of the True Law*. (Sacred Books of the East XXI). Oxford 1884, p. 227 seems to follow suit with “terraces of flowers”. F. Edgerton also follows the Tibetan translation in his

<sup>3</sup> As seen correctly in BHSD, where the word *puṣpa-grahaṇī* is hidden in the entry *grahaṇī*, Kern's text *puṣṭhagrahaṇīvedikā*°, SP 239,3 should be corrected to *puṣṭhagrahaṇīvedikā*° following SP (Khotan) 117,5 and other manuscripts, cf. however *puphagahaṇīyapaṭa* in an inscription from Amarāvātī, M. Nakanishi & O. v. Hinüber, as note 7 below, p. 45.

<sup>4</sup> The formula *śobhati bhāsati tapati virocati* (3+3+3+4), suppressed in later versions, is one of the numerous indications that SP (Khotan) preserves an older version of the text, cf. O. v. Hinüber, “A *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* Manuscript from Khotan. The gift of a pious family.” *The Journal of Oriental Studies*. Hachioji. 24. 2014, pp. 134–156, particularly p. 136 and Seishi Karashima, “Some Features of the Language of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra*.” *IJJ* 44. 2001, pp. 207–230.

<sup>5</sup> Read: *paṭṭa*° for *paṭu*° and *ghaṇṭāsata*° for *ganvāgata*°.

<sup>6</sup> The word *puṣṭhagrahaṇī* is not found in the Chinese translations; for Kumārajīva cf. Senchu Murano: *The Sutra of the Lotus Flower of the wonderful Law*. Tokyo 1974, p. 165 “railings and ten million chambers” and correspondingly Max Deeg: *Das Lotos-Sutra*. Darmstadt 2007, p. 185 “Geländer und zehn Millionen Kammern,” cf. also Seishi Karashima: *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra in the Light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*. Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica 3. Tokyo 1992, p. 145. — The Tibetan equivalent is given in Yasunori Ejima: *Index to the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*. *Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese*. Tokyo 1985–1993, p. 639 foll. s.v. *puṣpa-grahaṇīya-vedikā*(*sahasra*) as *me thog bkram paḥi stegs bu*; J. S. Negi: *Tibetan Sanskrit Dictionary* (Sarnath) notes the following Sanskrit equivalents: *me thog bkram pa* “*puṣpābhikīrṇam*,” Vol. 10 (ma) 2003, p. 4463 and *stegs(-bu)* “*vedikā*,” Vol. 5 (tha, tha) 1998, p. 1863.

entry in BHSD “balconies filled with (containing: Tib. *bkram pa*, besprinkled with) flowers.”

A new clue to the meaning of this rare word is now provided by the inscriptions from Kanaganahalli,<sup>7</sup> where the architectural term *puphagahani* can still be read in many inscriptions and was perhaps even written on all of the approximately 100 *puphagahanis* forming the railing, which encloses the so called “upper *pradakṣiṇapatha*” of the Adhālaka Mahācetiya. If inscriptions such as *catanikāya puphagahani dāna*, II.2,1 are compared to ... *āyāgathabhā catāri deyadhama*, II.1,1 or ... *deyadhama chata*, II.5,6 and many others of this kind, all found on the very object, which was donated, it is clear that *puphagahani* also designates the donated object, on which the word is engraved that is a part of the low, only 30cm high railing. The technical term seems to occur at Kanaganahalli for the first time in epigraphical texts and can help to better understand the very rare passages, where it is found in Buddhist literature.

Two texts can be added to the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*. Both deal with the mystic meaning of the different parts of a Stūpa. The first is a quotation from Bhadravyūha’s *Prakīrṇakacaityalakṣaṇa* (Prak-c-1) embedded in the *Stūpalakṣaṇakārikāvivecana* (Stūpal-k-v),<sup>8</sup> where *puspagrahaṇī* is mentioned in the following context:

1. *dānaṃ pṛthivī*; 2. *śīlan nemi*; 3. *catvāry āryavaṃśā aṅgaṇā*; 4. *catvāry āryasatyāni sopānāni*; 5. *vaiśāradyāni stambhāḥ*; 6. *smṛtyupasthānāni adharā vedī*; 7. *samyakprahāṇāni dvitīyā vedī*; 8. *ṛddhipādās tṛtīyā vedī*; 9. *śraddhādīni pañcendriyāni caturthī jaṃghāvedī*; 10. *śraddhādīni pañcabalāni kaṇṭhakaṃ*; 11. *anīyādīni dharmamukhāni catasraḥ puṣpa-graṇyāḥ*; 12. *anāsravāḥ prathamadhyānabhūmijā [prasrabdhi]<sup>9</sup> prasrabdisaṃbodhyaṅgaṃ kaṇṭhakaṃ*; 13. *dvitīyatṛtīyadhyānabhūmijā prīti prītisaṃbodhyaṅgaṃ kaṇṭhaka-valayaṃ valitakaṃ*; 14. *anāgamyacaturthadhyānādibhūmijā upekṣāvedanā upekṣāsaṃbodhyaṅgaṃ harmikā*; 15. *smṛtidharmapravicayavīryasamādhisaṃbodhyaṅgāni catvāro lokapālāḥ*; ... 20. *candrasūryau*..., Stūpal-k-v § 3, nos. 1-20.

The number of Buddhist concepts with which the architectural parts of a Stūpa are identified, may be helpful occasionally, when trying to understand the meaning of an individual term. However, there is not everywhere a clear correspondence between the respective part of the Stūpa and the number of concepts.

Numbers 1 and 2 contain one item each: The merit made by a donation is symbolized by the compound (*pṛthivī*) for the Stūpa, which is described from bottom to top in the subsequent enumeration: *adharā bhūmi pādāya yāvad ūrddhvaṃ krameṇa tu*, Stūpal-k-v, verse 29. The *nemi* “rim” might refer to a wheel-shaped substructure found in some

<sup>7</sup> Maiko Nakanishi & O. v. Hinüber: *Kanaganahalli Inscriptions*. ARIRIAB XVII. Tokyo 2014. Supplement, pp. 44–57, chapter II.2 Puphagahanis and O. v. Hinüber, “Buddhist Texts and Buddhist Images,” pp. 7–20 in this issue of ARIRIAB.

<sup>8</sup> This text was discovered and edited by Gustav Roth, “Edition of the *Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecanaṃ* including the *Prakīrṇaka-caitya-lakṣaṇaṃ*,” in: *Dharmadūta. Mélanges offerts au Vénérable Thich Huyen-Vi à l’occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire dirigés par Bhikkhu Tampalawela Dhammaratana, Bhikkhu Pāsādika*. Paris 1997, pp. 205–231, cf. also G. Roth, “Symbolism of the Buddhist Stūpa according to the Tibetan version of the *Caitya-vibhāga-vinayodbhāva-sūtra*, the Sanskrit treatise *Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana*, and the corresponding passage in Kuladatta’s *Kriyāsaṃgraha*,” in: Anna Libera Dallapiccola: *The Stūpa*. Beiträge zur Südasienforschung 55. Wiesbaden 1980, pp. 183–209 = G. Roth: *Indian Studies (Selected Papers)*. Delhi 1986, pp. 251–277. Both these articles replace G. Roth, “Remarks on the *Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana*,” in: *Prof. Syed Hasan Askari Felicitation Volume*. JBRS (Special Number). Patna 1968, pp. 31–46.

<sup>9</sup> This word is missing in the manuscript.

excavated Stūpas.<sup>10</sup> Numbers 3 to 8 all contain four concepts thus corresponding to a quadrangular courtyard and perhaps quadrangular platforms. Number 5 refers to most likely four pillars (= four *vaiśāradyāni*) at four corners of a platform, which can be reached by four flights of steps, or alternatively, but perhaps less likely to a set of four *āyāgathambhas* at one entrance to the *pradakṣiṇapatha* as at the Adhālaka Mahācetiya in Kanaganahalli.

This list roughly corresponds to the one in Kuladatta's *Kriyāsaṃgraha*, where there are two enumerations of the parts of the Stūpa at the beginning of the eighth and last chapter, which opens with a śloka that serves as table of content:<sup>11</sup>

*lakṣaṇaṃ dharmadhātūnāṃ dhvajānāṃ avaropanaṃ*  
*jīrṇoddhāropasaṃhārau<sup>12</sup> puḥayed gaṇamaṇḍalaṃ*

“Characteristics of a stūpa (*dharmadhātu*), implantation of banners, repairs and dismantling (of the *maṇḍala*), he should honour the communal celebration” (after T. Skorupski).<sup>13</sup>

The first enumeration (*Kriyāsaṃgraha* I) immediately following this verse gives the relative measurements of the individual parts of the Stūpa of the *dhānyākṛti* (“shape of a heap of rice grains”) type, from which only the relevant architectural parts are quoted:

3., 4.<sup>14</sup> ... *vedikā vartulā caturasrā dvādaśāṅgā viṃśatikoṇā vā kartvyā*; 5. *tadūrdhvaṃ ... jaṅghāvedī ... sā ca vartulaiva kartvayā*; 6., 7. ... *atra ca kumbho madhye* ...; 8. *tadūrdhvaṃ ... harmikā* ...; 9. ... *harmikodvedhaḥ ... kaṇṭhikā ... kaṇṭhikāvalaya* ...; 10. *śeṣāṇi puṣpagrahaṇī* ...; 11. *hrāsa* ...; (12-15 concern the *yaṣṭī*); 16. *lokapālaharmikayor antare* ...; 17. ... *chatrāvalī ... cakrāvalī* ...<sup>15</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Shoshin Kuwayama, “The Wheel-shaped Structure inside Stūpa. A Hidden Import from Augustan Rome,” in: *Gandharan Art in Context: East-West Exchanges at the Cross Roads of Asia*, ed. by R. & B. Allchin et alii. Cambridge 1997, pp. 119–171 = *Across the Hindukush of the First Millennium. A Collection of the Papers by S. Kuwayama*. Kyoto 2002, pp. 44–68; cf. the plates in Himanshu Prabha Ray (ed.): *Sanghol and the Archaeology of Punjab*. Delhi 2010, frontispiece and p. 94; *Indian Archaeology. A Review 1985–86* [1990], Plate LXIII (Sanghol) and a similar megalith circle from Komaranahalli in *Indian Archaeology. A Review 1980–81* [1983], plate XVIII, A.

<sup>11</sup> The text is edited and discussed, but often very poorly understood by Mireille Bénisti, “Étude sur le stūpa dans l’Inde ancienne.” *BEFEO* 50. 1960, pp. 37–116, particularly pp. 89–105 = “A Study of Stūpas in Ancient India,” in: M. Bénisti: *Stylistics of Buddhist Art in India*. Volume I: Text. Delhi 2003, pp. 1–102, particularly pp. 69–92. — For an abbreviated translation see Tadeusz Skorupski: *Kriyāsaṃgraha. Compendium of Buddhist Rituals. An abridged version*. Buddhica Britannica Series Continua X. Tring 2002 [rev.: Karel Werner, *JRAS* 13. 2003, pp. 260 foll.], where references to literature on the *Kriyāsaṃgraha* are collected.

<sup>12</sup> So read with the Nepalese ms. originally copied during the reign of Abhayamalla in the Yaśodharā-mahāvihāra NS *jyaiṣṭha* 337 (AD 1216) and re-copied NS *jyaiṣṭha* 1085 (AD 1964) (Facsimile ed. [of the copy of 1964] by Sharada Rani, Śata-Piṭaka Series 236. Delhi 1977).

<sup>13</sup> The table of content was not recognized as such by M. Bénisti, and, consequently, completely misunderstood.

<sup>14</sup> The numbering follows M. Bénisti’s division of the text into paragraphs, although it is not always correct.

<sup>15</sup> Only in the Vinayas of the Mahāsaṃghikas and the Mūlasarvāstivādins *cakras* are mentioned in this position: André Barea, “La construction et le culte des stūpa d’après les Vinayapiṭaka.” *BEFEO* 50. 1962, pp. 229–274, particularly p. 236. These wheels are perhaps depicted in a rare petroglyph from Shing Nala (Upper Indus): D. Bandini-König: *Die Felsbildstationen Shing Nala und Gichi Nala*. MANP 4. Mainz 2001, p. 39 and Shing Nala 36:1 (cf. plate 27 [tracing], partly visible also on plate 91 [36:2]). Unfortunately, no complete image of this important drawing is provided in MANP. The pertinent discussion (p. 39) needs correction. For, the supposed parallel from Bhārhut, which cannot be traced in Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy: *La sculpture de Bhārhut*. Annales du Musée Guimet. Bibliothèque d’art. Nouvelle série: VI. Paris 1956 does not show a *cakra*, but a *padma* as other images do as well: see Coomaraswamy fig. 18, 64, 65.

The sequence *vedī*, *jaṃghāvedī*, *kumbha* is the same for all four types of Stūpas.<sup>16</sup>

The second enumeration of the individual parts of the Stūpa (*Kriyāsaṃgraha* II), which immediately follows these more technical architectural definitions, contains again mystical identifications corresponding to those given in the Stūpal-k-v (Prak-c-l). This part of the *Kriyāsaṃgraha*, which is not discussed by M. Bénisti, is edited by G. Roth:<sup>17</sup>

3. *dānaṃ prthivī. śīlaṃ nemi* ...; 4. *daśa ... adhovedikā. bhittir vedikāvistārasyāṣṭāṃśena kartavyā*; 5. *jagatī ... catvāry* ...; 6. *catvāri ... vedīcaturmukhāni* ...; 7. ... *catvāri toraṇāni*; 8. ... *catvāri pratimāgrhāni*; 9. *catvāri ... catuḥkoṇāni*; 10. *catvāri ... adharā vedī*; 11. *catvāri ... dvitīyā vedī*; 12. ... *pañca ... jaṃghāvedī*; 13. *pañca ... kaṇṭhakaṃ*; 14. *anityādidharmamukhaviśuddhyā †mukhan†*<sup>18</sup> *catasra puṣpagrahaṇyaḥ*; 15. ... *kaṇṭhakaṃ*; 16. ... *kaṇṭhikāvalayavalitakaṃ*; 17. ... *harmikā*...; 18. ... *catvāro lokapālāḥ* ...; 21. *candrasūryau* ...

When comparing these two paragraphs and the enumeration in the Stūpal-k-v, it is clear that the sub-structure of the dome (*kumbha*) consists of a number of platforms (*vedī*), of which the topmost is called *jaṃghāvedī*, in the middle of which the dome (*kumbha*) rises (cf. fig. 6, p. 96 = 79 in M. Bénisti). The *jaṃghāvedī* thus corresponds to the *pādavedikā* mentioned once in the *Mahāvamsa* (see below). The dome is crowned by the *harmikā*, which is adorned by images of the four *lokapālas*,<sup>19</sup> sun and moon.

The term *jaṃghāvedī* is not yet understood. G. Roth translates “the ‘shank’ terrace-step” and discusses the problematic Tibetan translation, which seems to indicate that the meaning of *jaṃghāvedī* was unknown to the translators (Roth, p. 715 note 9); correspondingly T. Skorupski has “shank *vedī*” and M. Bénisti “platform with legs / plate-forme des jambes,” which she takes to indicate the “the anthropomorphic symbolism of the *stūpa*” (p. 91 = 79).

<sup>16</sup> On the different types of Stūpas (*dhānyākṛti*, *pātrākṛti*, *khagaṇḍākṛti*, *kalaśākṛti*) cf. Senarat Paranavithana: *The Stūpa in Ceylon*. Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon Volume V. Colombo 1946, p. 27: *ghaṇṭākāra-ghaṭākāraṃ bubbulākāra-dhānyakaṃ padmākārāmbalaśaḍvidhaṃ* referring also to *thūpo ... vīhiraśisadiso*, Thūp (2) 1971, 199,32 (= *dhānyaka*), which is misquoted by M. Bénisti, p. 75 = 94 (“terme pāli *dhanyākāra* mentionné dans le Thūpavamsa”). The verse is also quoted by Hans Ruelius, “The Stūpa in the Śilpaśāstras and the Rituals of the Sinhalese,” in: *The Stūpa* 1980 (as note 8 above), pp. 267–276, particularly p. 274. The different types of Stūpas mentioned in Stūpal-k-v are: *kalaśa*, *kumbha*, *khagaṇḍa*, *dhānyarāśi*, *pātra*. — The explanation of the (at first sight) strange Tibetan translation of Sanskrit *khagaṇḍa* “bird’s egg” as *yan lag drug* “*śaḍaṅga*” discussed by T. Skorupski, p. 165, note 2 (“puzzling”) is probably quite simple. This translation, which is later than the oldest extant manuscripts (T. Skorupski, p. 3 “late 13<sup>th</sup> century”), seems to be based on a corrupt text: As the pronunciation *kha* for *śa* was widely spread, the Tibetan translator probably “corrected” a corruption *\*khaḍaṅga*, in which the characters *ḍa* and *ga* were misplaced, into the wrong direction; *khagaṇḍa* is misread by M. Bénisti, p. 91 = 73, no. 23 as *sa gaṇḍā*-° and translated as “with the shape of a bulb / à la forme d’un bulbe” (!), cf. also G. Roth, *JBRs* 63-64. 1977-1978, p. 711 note 2.

<sup>17</sup> “A Stūpa Passage in Kuladatta’s *Kriyāsaṃgraha*.” *JBRs* 63 & 64. 1977–1978 (L. N. Mishra Commemoration Volume), pp. 709–722.

<sup>18</sup> The translation of *mukhan* by “on the surface” (G. Roth) is plainly wrong, while the Tibetan “door” (*sgo bzi dan me-thog* ‘*dsin-pa*’o) is correct, though syntax remains obscure: read *mukhe* or *mukheṣu* (?), see below.

<sup>19</sup> The *lokapālas* are visible, e.g., on Stūpa images from Chilās and Thalpan: D. Bandini-König: *Die Felsbildstation Thalpan I*. MANP 6. Mainz 2003, Chilās-Brücke 30:1, Thalpan 30:26 with plates IIIa, b and XXIIa, c. These *lokapālas* were recognized as such, however without any textual reference, by Monique Maillard & Robert Jera-Bezard, “Les stūpas de Kuberavāhana à Chilās et Thalpan,” in: *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan*. Reports and Studies Vol. 3. Mainz 1994, pp. 173–199, particularly pp. 176–179. This evidence is not quoted in Corinna Wessels-Mevissen: *The Gods of the Directions in Ancient India*. Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie Band 14. Berlin 2001, p. 18 foll.

However, unhelpful “translations” like “shank *vedī*” without any explanation amount to simply transferring the individual members of a compound of unknown meaning from one language to another without paying any attention to the semantics of the compound itself.<sup>20</sup>

A simple and adequate interpretation can be found once Buddhist Sanskrit and Pāli *jaṅghāvihāra* “walk, stroll (on foot)” (BHSD) is compared or, better still, Pāli *jaṅghāmagga* “foot path” and *jaṅghāummagga* “tunnel, through which one can walk,” and finally Skt. *jaṅghāpatha* “foot path.”<sup>21</sup> Therefore, a *jaṅghāvedī* is most likely the top-most terrace, on which one walks around the dome, which rises in the middle. Consequently, the *jaṅghavedī* **must** be round (*vartulā eva*) like the round dome (*kumbha*) according to the description in *Kriyāsamgraha* I,5 in contrast to the *adharā vedī*, which may be round (*vartulā*), square (*caturasrā*) etc.

The *kumbha* crowned by the *harmikā* occurs only in *Kriyāsamgraha* I, while in *Kriyāsamgraha* II and in Stūpala-k-v the *kumbha* is not mentioned at all. The sequence of architectural parts located below the *harmikā* is *jaṅghāvedī* – *kaṇṭhaka* – *puṣpagrahaṇī* – *kaṇṭhaka* – *kaṇṭhikāvalayavalitaka* – *harmikā*. Consequently, it seems that there are two parts of the dome of the Stūpa called *kaṇṭhaka* “neck” divided by one (or more) *puṣpagrahaṇīs*.

Comparing all three paragraphs on the parts of the Stūpa it is at once obvious that those two, which provide a mystic meaning for the individual parts in the Stūpal-k-v and in *Kriyāsamgraha* II run by and large parallel and are basically the same text. The source of *Kriyāsamgraha* I, on the other hand, seems to be a text on architecture, which was incorporated into a handbook on rituals.<sup>22</sup>

Stūpal-k-v:	Kriyāsamgraha II:	Kriyāsamgraha I:
8. tṛtīyā vedī	11. dvitīyā vedī	3., 4. vedikā
9. caturthī jaṅghāvedī	12. jaṅghāvedī	5. jaṅghāvedī
10. kaṇṭhakam	13. kaṇṭhakam	6., 7. kumbho
11. catasraḥ <b>puṣpagrahaṇyāḥ</b>	14. catasra <b>puṣpagrahaṇyāḥ</b>	8. harmikā
12. kaṇṭhakam	15. kaṇṭhakam	9a. kaṇṭhikā
13. kaṇṭhakāvalayaṃ valitakam	16. kaṇṭhikāvalayavalitakam	9b. kaṇṭhikāvalaya
14. harmikā	17. harmikā	10. <b>puṣpagrahaṇī</b>

The different components of a *stūpa* are named from bottom to top as indicated by *tadūrdhvaṃ* in *Kriyāsamgraha* I nos. 5 and 8 (and later *tadupari*, no 18. *tadūrdhvaṃ*, no. 19). While the sequence of *Kriyāsamgraha* I *vedikā* – *jaṅghāvedī* – *kumbha* – *harmikā* is thus easily understood,<sup>23</sup> the exact position and meaning of the elements above the *jaṅghāvedī* in Stūpal-k-v and *Kriyāsamgraha* II are not, as mirrored in the various and not very successful

<sup>20</sup>. This amounts to a translation of, e.g., German “Bahn-hof” by “lane-courtyard” instead of “railway station.”

<sup>21</sup>. Quoted from the *Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa* by Prasanna Kumar Acharya: *An Encyclopaedia of Hindu Architecture*. Mānasāra Series Vol. VII. London 1946 and in Vaman Shivaram Apte: *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Poona <sup>2</sup>1957, s. v.

<sup>22</sup>. Only *Kriyāsamgraha* I gives instructions concerning the measurement of different parts of the Stūpa, cf. H. Ruelius, “The Stūpa in the Śilpasastras,” as note 16 above, on corresponding evidence from Ceylon.

<sup>23</sup>. Nos. 12–19 deal with the very top, which is the same in all four types of *stūpas*: *harmikā*, *yaṣṭikāgra*, *lokapāla*, *chatrāvalī*, *cakrāvalī*, *varṣasthālī*, *uṣṇīṣa*. In *Kriyāsamgraha* II nos. 21–26 *candrasūryau*, *ghaṇṭā*, *dhvaja* and *patākā* are added. All this is found in images from the upper Indus, see note 19 above.

attempts at translations: *kaṇṭhaka* “moulding” (G. Roth), “cornice/corniche” (M. Bénisti), “ledge” (T. Skorupski), the *kaṇṭhakavalaya* “round of the cornice” (M. Bénisti), “ledge’s girdle” (T. Skorupski) and *kaṇṭhakavalayavalitaka* “girdle ornament of the necklace with a wrinkled decor (round the dome of the *stūpa*)” (G. Roth, *Kriyāsaṃgraha* II), “adornment around the *kaṇṭhikā*” (T. Skorupski) and “border design round the neck (dome), which is a wrinkled decor” (G. Roth, *Stūpal-k-v*).

At first, the wording †*mukha*† *catasraḥ puṣpagrahaṇyaḥ* is equally puzzling and obscure as various attempts at a translation show: “the four openings and the flower-holder” (T. Skorupski) and “four flower holders on the surface” (G. Roth, *Kriyāsaṃgraha* II).<sup>24</sup> The same is true for *śeṣāṇi puṣpagrahaṇī* “flower bouquets are in surplus / en surplus sont les bouquets de fleurs<sup>25</sup>” (M. Bénisti) and “the rest serves as flower support” (T. Skorupski). Nothing can be concluded from the context, neither the signification of the number “four” nor the referent of *śeṣāṇi* “the rest.”

However, a key to the understanding might be provided by *Stūpal-k-v* § 15 quoting from *Prak-c-l*:

*yataḥ prakīrṇake uktaṃ. caturdikṣu āyakāḥ karttavyāḥ. †ayameṣu† buddhavigrahaḥ sthāpayitavyā. puṣpagrahaṇī karttavyā.*<sup>26</sup>

“Because it is said in the *Prakīrṇaka*: ‘In the four directions, *āyaka*(-platforms/columns) should be built. (At the *āyākas*?) Buddha images should be erected. (A) *puṣpagrahaṇī*(s) should be made.’”

If this description is combined with †*mukha*† *catasraḥ puṣpagrahaṇyaḥ*, it seems that at each entrance there was a Buddha image and a *puṣpagrahaṇī* and that there were, consequently, two possible interpretations of the word *puṣpagrahaṇī*. It was either, as in Kanaganahalli, a small terrace running around the *Stūpa*<sup>27</sup> or, alternatively, one of four separate unconnected *puṣpagrahaṇīs* at the entrances (*mukhe* or *mukheṣu*).

In the *Stūpasamdarśanaparivartta* the *puṣpagrahaṇīvedikās* occur together with *torāṇas* “doorways”, *patākās* “flags”, *vaijayantīs* “banners”, *dāmas* “garlands”, *paṭṭas* “cloths”, *ghaṇṭās* “bells” and the *chatrāvalī* “line of umbrellas.” These parts of a *Stūpa* were obviously considered as the most visible and beautiful ones, which is confirmed in various images from the Upper Indus (see note 19). Only the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, which is certainly much older than both *Stūpal-k-v*<sup>28</sup> and *Kriyāsaṃgraha* (before 1200)<sup>29</sup> knows *puṣpagrahaṇī-*

<sup>24</sup>. The technical term *puṣpagrahaṇī* can no longer be considered as “a particularity of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins” as surmised by G. Roth, *JBRS* 63-64. 1977–1978, p. 715 note 11.

<sup>25</sup>. Explained as: “Il s’agit de l’ensemble des fleurs prises ensemble, c’est-à-dire de décor en forme de touffes et de guirlandes” (p. 99, note 4 = p. 83, note 3).

<sup>26</sup>. *ayameṣu* is unclear, read *āyakeṣu* (?); Buddha images are indeed found at the four entrances to *Stūpas*. — The text of the subsequent explanation is partly incomprehensible and most likely corrupt: *tatrāyakaśabdena pratipālakam ucyaṭe. puṣpagrahaṇīśabdena {na} ca vedikābāhyataḥ samantato vāpya paṃktyākāreṇa nānā-saṃsthānagrhadvāramātre pūrvajātakapratimāṇāṃ racaneti*, *Stūpal-k-v* § 15: in *puṣpagrahaṇīśabdena {na} ca* the second *na* seems to be a dittography; read *vāpya* following to G. Roth (?).

<sup>27</sup>. It is not impossible that this interpretation is hidden in *vedikābāhyataḥ samantato vāpya paṃktyākāreṇa* (see preceding note) “in form of a line encompassing (the *Stūpa*?) uninterrupted at the outside of the *vedikā*” (?).

<sup>28</sup>. On the uncertain date of this text: J. W. de Jong *IJJ* 38. 1995. p. 194: It is certainly much later than “ca. 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D.” as assumed in G. Roth, “Symbolism of the Buddhist *Stūpa*,” as note 8 above, p. 202 = 270.

<sup>29</sup>. According to G. Roth, as preceding note, “ca. 8th century A.D.” however without providing any evidence,



*vedikās*. This concurs with the evidence from Kanaganahalli. The Adhālaka Mahācetiya is indeed provided with the lower *pradakṣiṇapatha* and with a terrace above where there are inscribed *puphagahanis*,<sup>30</sup> which corresponds neatly to a *puspagrahaṇīvedikā* “a platform / terrace with a railing to hold flowers” and furthermore to the evidence from ancient Ceylon, where the corresponding term is Pāli *pupphādhāna* (see below). On the other hand, Stūpal-k-v and the *Kriyāsaṃgraha*, both use *puspagrahaṇī* without *vedikā*, probably because in these later texts separate “flower receptacles” at the entrances were meant.

At the Adhālaka Mahācetiya at Kanaganahalli the *puphagahani* (= *puspagrahaṇī*[-*vedikā*]) divides the lower from the upper drum-slabs running around the dome of the Stūpa. Images on slabs from Amarāvātī seem to show the same or similar structures of Stūpas.<sup>31</sup> Comparing this visual evidence to the sequence *kaṇṭhaka* - *puspagrahaṇī* - *kaṇṭhaka* in *Kriyāsaṃgraha* II and Stūpal-k-v it seems that *kaṇṭhaka* corresponds to that part of the dome, which is called *kumbha* in *Kriyāsaṃgraha* I, to which the lower and upper drum-slabs are attached.

Starting from this observation, the term *kaṇṭhaka* “neck (ornament)” should, as a technical term of the Stūpa architecture, designate the parts of a Stūpa, which are adorned with two girdles of slabs<sup>32</sup> with various images. They are horizontally separated from each other by the *puspagrahaṇī*(*vedikā*). If so, *kaṇṭhaka* “neck (ornament)” designates the outer wall of the dome, and should perhaps be even translated by “wall.” For, in a much later text on architecture, the *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra*<sup>33</sup> ascribed to King Bhoja of Dhar (died about 1060), the word *kaṇṭha* / *kaṇṭhā* indeed means “wall” as shown, e.g., in the following enumeration of synonyms: *yā tu kaṇṭhā kuḍyaṃ bhittiś cayaś ca sā*, 18,26.

This interpretation presupposes a development from *puphagahani* (attested in Kanaganahalli) as a synonym of *puspagrahaṇī-vedikā* (attested in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*) to a later usage when there were four separate *puspagrahaṇīs* at the entrances to the *pradakṣiṇapatha* (attested in Stūpal-k-v § 15) and no longer a single continuous platform running around the Stūpa. Therefore, an old sequence *kaṇṭhaka* – *puspagrahaṇī*(*vedikā*) –

---

cf. T. Skorupski, p. 3 foll.

<sup>30</sup> Of course the number of *puspagrahaṇīvedikās* given in both versions of SP, either 5000 or as 1000 do not offer any help.

<sup>31</sup> Robert Knox: *Amaravati. Buddhist Sculpture from the Great Stupa*. London 1992, plates 69–76. The Stūpa shown in a relief on the north *torāṇa* of the Great Stūpa at Sāñcī in Susan L. Huntington: *The Art of Ancient India. Buddhist, Hindu, Jain*. New York 1985, p. 99 = Vidya Dehija (ed.): *The Unseen Presence. The Buddha and Sanchi*. Bombay 1996, p 98 fig. 5 seems to be of a different type.

<sup>32</sup> Similarly G. Roth, “Symbolism of the Buddhist Stūpa,” as note 8 above, p. 194 = 263 “the neck = dome (?)” it is, however, not correct to state (ibidem note 43) “*kumbha* ... or *aṇḍa* is to be expected here.” For, *aṇḍa* and *kumbha* seem to belong to the terminology of different schools, Mūlasarvāstivāda and Lokottaravāda respectively, cf. the (Mūlasarvāstivāda) enumeration of parts of the Stūpa: *jagatīcātuṣkaṃ jaṅghā-aṇḍa-harmikā-yaṣṭayas trayodaśa chatrāṇi varṣasthālaka-nityākārāḥ*, Guṇaprabha: *Vinayasūtra*, ed. by Rahula Sankrityayana. Singhi Jain Series 74. Bombay 1981, p. 120,1f (no. 62) “four terraces, terrace to circumambulate the Stūpa, dome, *harmikā*, central pole, 13 umbrellas, rain receptacle are the essential characteristics (of the Stūpa of a Buddha).” In the *Divyāvadāna* the lowest terrace is enclosed by the *pratikaṇṭhukā* (see below). Above this level three terraces (*medhī*) are raised (Divy 244,7–10). This corresponds to the four *jagatīs* of the *Vinayasūtra*. The term *medhī* is also used in *yataḥ prakīrṇake h’ uktaṃ ... caturasrikā medhī vedī jaṅghāpuṭāvedī kartavyeti*, Stūpal-k-v § 13, cf. note 51 below.

<sup>33</sup> Date and authorship are uncertain according to Felix Otter: *Residential Architecture in Bhoja’s Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra. Introduction, text, translation and notes*. Delhi 2010, p. 37; on the word *kaṇṭha* / *kaṇṭhā* see index s.v. and the discussion § 1.3.1.1.2.

*kaṇṭhaka* as in *Kriyāsaṃgraha* II and Stūpa-I-v had to be modernized at some point and, taking into account the changed meaning of *puṣpagrahaṇī*, the words *mukhe[ṣu] catasrah* “at the entrance(s) four ...” were inserted without, however, making the necessary changes also in the sequence of the enumeration, by moving *puṣpagrahaṇī* from position 14 to position 9 after position 8 *catvāri pratimāgrhāni* in *Kriyāsaṃgraha* I (and in Stūpa-I-v according), thus adjusting the sequence to *āyaka – buddhavigraha – puṣpagrahaṇī* in Stūpal-k-v § 15 discussed above. On the other hand, *puṣpagrahaṇī* appears in *Kriyāsaṃgraha* I only in position 10 above the *harmikā* (position 8), which does not make any sense at all, because the components of the Stūpa are enumerated from bottom to top here as well. Thus a look at the, as it seems, disturbed structure of the enumerations might support the assumed change in meaning of *puṣpagrahaṇī*.

If *kaṇṭhaka* is indeed the lower part of the dome, the drum, it is perhaps possible to better understand the frequently discussed description of the enlargement of the Stūpa of Buddha Kṣemaṃkara in the *Divyāvadāna* (Divy 244,7–13):

*tatas tasya stūpasya sarvair eva caturbhiḥ pārśvaiḥ pratikaṇṭhakayā* [v. 1. *pratikaṇṭakayā*]  
*catvāri sopānāny ārabdhāni kārayitum*, Div 244,7f.

“Then, at all the four sides at the *pratikaṇṭhukā* the construction four stairs was begun.”

So far, the meaning of the crucial word *prati-kaṇṭhukā* is not understood.<sup>34</sup> All, who discussed this sentence, refer to PW *pratikaṇṭham* “einzeln” quoted only as a technical term of ancient Indian phonetics and defined later by Louis Renou as “forme irrégulière”.<sup>35</sup> However, transferring a technical term of phonetics by generalisation to architecture is risky and almost necessarily ends up in unsurmountable difficulties. If, however, *prati-kaṇṭhukā* is connected to the assumed technical meaning in architecture *kaṇṭhaka* “(outer) wall (of the drum),” a *prati-kaṇṭhukā* would be the “counter-wall” or periphery, the outer part of the *vedikā* out of which the drum and the dome rise. For the dome was built in its entirety first and the terraces surrounding it added later.<sup>36</sup> The outer wall of the terrace (*vedikā*) is exactly the area, where the stairs to access the different terraces are built.<sup>37</sup>

Above the “neck (ornament)” or “wall” (*kaṇṭhaka*) is the *kaṇṭhikā-valaya-valitaka*. This might refer to the decoration consisting in different patters as seen on the dome above the drum slabs from Amarāvātī. The word *valitaka* can mean “ornament” in a Buddhist context

<sup>34</sup>. The last to discuss *prati-kaṇṭhukā* in detail is G. Roth, “Bemerkungen zum Stūpa des Kṣemaṃkara,” *StII* 5/6. (Festschrift Paul Thieme). 1980, pp. 181–194, particularly p. 183 = “Remarks on the Stūpa of Kṣemaṃkara.” *JNRC* 7. 1985, pp. 183–197, particularly p. 186 in response to Ludwig Alsdorf, “Der Stūpa des Kṣemaṃkara.” (1955), in: *Kleine Schriften*. Stuttgart 2001, pp. 592–599, particularly p. 596. V. S. Agrawala, “Some Obscure Words in the *Divyāvadāna*,” *JAOS* 86. 1966, pp. 67–75, particularly p. 74 s. v. *pratikaṇṭhukā* “space between the actual stūpa and the railing” is almost correct. This important remark is not quoted by G. Roth.

<sup>35</sup>. L. Renou: *Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit*. Paris 1957, s.v., cf. also *Kāśikā* on Pāṇini 4.4.40 ... *grhṇātīty etasmin arthe ṭhakpratyayo bhavati: pratikaṇṭham grhṇāti prātikaṇṭhikah* “the suffix *ṭhak* is used meaning ‘to grasp’; ‘he grasps near the throat’: ‘grasping near the throat’.”

<sup>36</sup>. L. Alsdorf, as note 34 above, p. 596 referring to John Marshall: *A Guide to Sanchi*. Calcutta 1955, p. 34. – Moreover, as seen already by G. Roth, “Symbolism of the Buddhist Stūpa,” as note 8 above, p. 201 = 269 the puzzling *bhūpasyāṇḍa*, Divy 244,11 is a simple misreading of *bhūyasya-aṇḍa* “an egg-like dome of a larger size” (G. Roth). This, together with *abhinavāṇḍa*, Divy 244,12 (so read for *ati-°* following L. Alsdorf), clearly shows, as rightly emphasized by L. Alsdorf, that the dome was enlarged as well.

<sup>37</sup>. Perhaps this wall is meant in *Kriyāsaṃgraha* II 4. *adhovaedikā. bhittir ... kartavyā*.

(cf. BHSD s.v.), and a *valaya-valitaka* might be a “ring-ornament” that is running around the dome. If there is a difference in meaning, *kaṇṭhikā* and *kaṇṭhukā* might designate walls smaller than a *kaṇṭhaka*. It is also unclear, which kind of ornament is meant by (*kaṇṭhikā*-) *valaya-valitaka* above or on the *harmikā* in *Kriyāsaṃgraha* II.

Considering the long development of Stūpa architecture with its many regional varieties, which lead to widely differing shapes of drums and domes, or structures above the *harmikā*, which is more than obvious already after a random check of images from Sāñcī or Amarāvātī and by comparing them to the petroglyphs along the Upper Indus,<sup>38</sup> the original meaning of many terms including *puṣpagrahaṇī* may have changed in course of time or was forgotten. This may be one of the reasons why *puṣpagrahaṇī* occurs in the comparatively early *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* and in the *Prakīrṇakacaityalakṣaṇa* quoted in Stūpal-k-v, which is perhaps a Lokottaravāda text, but seems to have been alien to the later Mūlasarvāstivāda texts.

Although the haze shrouding many details in the development of the Sanskrit terminology of Stūpa architecture cannot be dispelled completely, the new epigraphical evidence from Kanaganahalli allows a slightly clearer view and at the same time a better understanding of the beginning of the Stūpasamdarśanaparivartta of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, if only in one tiny point. At the same time, a problem or two in the *Stūpalakṣaṇakārikāvivecana* and the *Kriyāsaṃgraha* can be brought nearer to a solution. Still further progress can be made by looking at the material preserved in Theravāda sources in Ceylon

## Part II: Pupphādhāna and Vedikā

The terminology of Stūpa architecture in Pāli differs in many respects from that used in Buddhist Sanskrit. Architects working for the Sinhalese kings did not use the term *puṣpagrahaṇī* or *\*pupphaggahaṇī*, but *pupphādhāna* a word of similar meaning.<sup>39</sup> When comparing these two terms, it seems likely from the very beginning that a *pupphādhāna* might resemble a *puṣpagrahaṇī* and that it is also a terrace running around a Stūpa. Therefore it is useful to begin with the study of the generic term used for “terrace” (*vedikā*) in order to define the place of *pupphādhāna* in architectural terminology.

The word *vedikā* occurs only once in early Pāli canonical literature in the description of the palace of the Cakkavattī Sudassana (DN II 182,29–183,5).<sup>40</sup> As pointed out long ago by W. Geiger (1856–1943)<sup>41</sup>, it is not entirely clear whether a terrace with a railing or only a railing is described here. For, if the parallel wording in the description of the stairs (*sopāna*, DN II 181,29–32) of the same palace together with their railings is compared, it seems that

<sup>38</sup>. Various types of Stūpas can be compared in Volker Thewalt, “Rockcarvings and Inscriptions along the Indus. The Buddhist Tradition,” in: *South Asian Archaeology 1983*, ed. by Janine Schotsmans & Maurizio Taddei. Istituto Universitario Orientale. Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici. Series Minor XXIII. Volume 2. Naples 1985, pp. 779–800. Material from Gandhāra is now collected in Domenico Faccenna & Piero Spagnesi: *Buddhist Architecture in the Swat Valley, Pakistan. Stupas, Viharas, a Dwelling Unit*. ACT-Field School Project Reports and Memoirs Special Volume I. 2014.

<sup>39</sup>. I am grateful to Professor Dr. Adalbert Gail, Berlin, for drawing my attention to this term.

<sup>40</sup>. Cf. also the compound *vedikāvātapāna*, Vin II 148,29 “a window latticed like a railing.”

<sup>41</sup>. *The Mahāvamsa or Great Chronicle of Ceylon*, trsl. by Wilhelm Geiger. London 1912, Appendix D, p. 296 foll.

*vedikā* here also means “platform with a railing” rather than simply “railing.”<sup>42</sup> In the *Apadāna*, a late canonical Pāli text, the same uncertainty frequently prevails as well. It is, therefore, not always easy or even possible to make a clear distinction between the two meanings, either “platform, terrace” or “railing, enclosure.”

The semantic area of *vedikā* can be observed in the *Mahāvamsa*, where different types of *vedikās* are mentioned in various compounds when construction and repairs of Stūpas by Sinhalese kings are referred to. This material is supplemented from the *Aṭṭhakathā*, where the word *vedikā* occurs also, however in other contexts.

The word *pādavedi(kā)* occurs only twice in the *Mahāvamsa*:<sup>43</sup>

<i>pādavedikato yāva</i>	<i>dhuracchattā narādhipo</i>
<i>caturaṅgulabahalena</i>	<i>gandhena urucetiyaṃ</i>
<i>limpāpetvāna pupphāni</i>	<i>vaṇṭehi tattha sādhuḥkaṃ</i>
<i>nivesitvāna kāresi</i>	<i>thūpaṃ mālāguḷopamaṃ</i> , Mhv XXXIV 41-42

“And when the king had commanded that the Great Cetiya, from the *vedikā* at the foot to the parasol at the top, be plastered with (a paste of) sweet smelling-unguent four fingers thick and that flowers be carefully embedded therein by their stalks, he made the *thūpa* even as a globe of flowers” (W. Geiger).

Evidently, King Bhātika Abhaya (38-66 / 22 BC-6 AD)<sup>44</sup> covered the dome of the Mahāthūpa (*urucetiya*) with plaster and subsequently with flowers up to the top.

Not long afterwards, his nephew Āmaṇḍagāmaṇī Abhaya (79–89 / 19–29) continued the construction work at the same building:

<i>chattāticchattaṃ kāresi</i>	<i>mahāthūpe manorame</i>
<i>tatth’eva pādavediṃ ca</i>	<i>muddhavediṃ ca kārayi</i> , Mhv XXXV 2

“On the splendid Great Thūpa he caused to be made a parasol above the parasol,<sup>45</sup> and he built even there a *vedī* at the base and at the top” (W. Geiger).

In both descriptions, *pāda-vedikā* – *dhura-cchatta* and *pāda-vedī* – *muddha-vedi* designate opposite parts of the dome of the Stūpa, bottom and top. Therefore, the meaning of the technical term *pādavedikā* is indeed “*vedikā* at the foot” as W. Geiger translates, but, if the word *pāda-magga* in *eko adutiyo pattacīvaram ādāya pādamaggen’eva Sāvattthito*

<sup>42</sup> The technical terms of the individual parts of a railing are also mentioned: *thambha* “upright”, *sūcī* “cross-bar” and *unhīsa* “coping stone” (DN II 181,30 ≠ 183,2 foll.). — In contrast, the slightly different Sanskrit versions of the *Mahāsudarśana-sūtra* (and *-avadāna*) are straightforward excluding a translation “platform:” *prāsādaḥ caturvidhābhīr vedikābhīḥ parikṣipto ... vedikāyāḥ ... ālambanam adhiṣṭhānam sūcako māpito bhūt, Mahāsudarśana-avadāna*, edited by Hisashi Matsumura: *The Mahāsudarśanāvadāna and the Mahāsudarśana-sūtra*. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica no. 47. Delhi 1988, p. 20, § 10-10. On the meaning of *ālambana* cf. Nakanishi & v. Hinüber, as note 7 above, p. 60.

<sup>43</sup> Misprinted in the electronic Dhammagiri edition as *pādavecikā* and, consequently, untraceable. — The word *vedikāpāda*, Ps II 303,24-28 “foot of the enclosure” (*vedikāpādā ti sinerussa pariyante vedikāparikkhepā*, Ps-pt II 221,22 foll.) does not refer to Stūpa architecture.

<sup>44</sup> The dates of the Sinhalese kings from Duṭṭhagāmaṇī to Mahāsena should be pushed back by 60 years according to H. Bechert in the introduction (p. XX) to W. Geiger: *The Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times*. Wiesbaden 1986.

<sup>45</sup> W. Geiger remarks: “I.e. he heightened the cone crowning the thūpa at the top;” probaly rather “umbrella above umbrella” i.e. renewing all umbrellas at the top.

*tiṃsayojanāni gantvā*, Spk I 319,21 “all alone he walked with alms-bowl and robes on a foot-path thirty miles from Sāvatti” is compared, *pādavedikā* might also correspond to the Sanskrit term *jaṅghāvedikā* “terrace to walk around the dome” discussed above.<sup>46</sup>

Later, Senarat Paranavitana (1896–1972)<sup>47</sup> translated *pādavedikā* in these verses from the *Mahāvamsa* much more confidently as “railing at the foot” without paying any attention to W. Geiger’s justified doubts. However, S. Paranavitana has to concede that no such railings were discovered in any excavation, and, consequently, has to postulate that they were made of wood, what is of course possible. However, this lack of evidence for railings might also support an interpretation as “platform, terrace” rather.

Translated either way, the *pādavedikā* is the third (see below) and upper-most platform from (or in) which the dome immediately rises.

This part of a *cetiya* is also called *kucchivedikā* a term discussed by S. Paranavitana as well, who refers to *mahāthūpe vedikā dve*, Mhv XXXIV 39 (p. 18, note 4) and takes *kucchi* as a synonym of *udara* both meaning “the dome of the *stūpa*.” It is, however, only the much later commentary that uses *kucchivedikā muddhavedikā*, Mhv-ṭ 629,16 in the explanation of *vedikā dve* in this verse. This is pointed out later by S. Paranavitana himself, when he discusses *muddhavedikā*, which he translates by “railing on the summit” (p. 33).<sup>48</sup>

Moreover, the equivalence of *udara* and *thūpa* both meaning “dome” (postulated by S. Paranavitana, p. 25) emerges only from a comparison of an episode described in different words in the *Mahāvamsa*:

*pidahāpiya taṃ sabbaṃ rājā thūpaṃ samāpayi / caturassacayaṃ c’ettha cetiyamhi samāpayi*, Mhv XXXI 124

“enclosing all together the king completed the *thūpa* and, moreover, he completed the four-sided building<sup>49</sup> on the *cetiya*” (W. Geiger)

and in the *Thūpavamsa*:

*tato rājā taṃ sabbaṃ pidāhapetvā cetiyaṃ kārento udarena saddhiṃ caturassakoṭṭhakam*, Thūp (2) 248,3

“Thereupon the King, when he had all that closed up and was continuing with the construction of the *Cetiya* had the quadrangular platform<sup>50</sup> *harmikā* together with the (hemispherical) dome completed” (N. A. Jayawickrama, Thūp-trsl., p. 136).

Only this circumstantial evidence supports the equivalence of *thūpa* and *udara* (as a synonym of *kucchi*) all meaning “dome.”

The term *pādavedi(kā)* used in descriptions of building activities during the first century AD, does not occur outside the *Mahāvamsa*. The commentary to the *Mahāvamsa* replaces *pāda-vedikā* by *kucchivedikā*, which is used also in the *Aṭṭhakathā* and in the sub-commentaries. This seems to indicate a change in terminology equal to the one from *catur-*

<sup>46</sup>. The Sanskrit word *jaṅghāvedikā* was not yet known at the time of Geiger’s translation; it is unambiguous in contrast to *pāda-vedikā*.

<sup>47</sup>. S. Paranavitana: *Stūpa*, as note 16 above, p. 63 foll.

<sup>48</sup>. The building activities described here are renovations of the Thūpārāma also under King Bhātika Abhaya.

<sup>49</sup>. The word *caya* should be translated by “wall” rather, cf. Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra 18,26 quoted above.

<sup>50</sup>. “Quadrangular platform *harmikā*” is a mistranslation of *caturassakoṭṭhakam*, which designates the *harmikā*, see below.

*assa-caya* used in the *Mahāvamsa*, which is replaced by *catur-assa-koṭṭhaka* in the *Thūpavamsa*.

Three different types of *vedikās* are mentioned in the *Aṭṭhakathā*: *chattavedikā puṭavedikā kucchivedikā sīhāsanaṃ sīhasopānaṃ kāritaṃ*, Sv 650,17, which is explained as *cetiye chattassa heṭṭhā kātabbavedikā chattavedikā. cetiyaṃ parikkhipitvā padakkhiṇa-karaṇaṭṭhānaṃ antokatvā kātabbavedikā puṭavedikā. cetiyassa kucchiṃ parikkhipitvā taṃsambandham eva katvā kātabbavedikā kucchivedikā*, Sv-pt II 280,5-14 “the *vedikā* to be built below the umbrella is the ‘umbrella-*vedikā*,’ the ‘packing-railing’ is the railing to be built around the Cetiya enclosing the path (*thāna* ‘place’) for circumambulation (of the Cetiya); the platform to be built around the dome of the Cetiya in close connection to it is the ‘belly-platform.’” While there is some hesitation, whether to take *vedikā* to mean either “platform” or “railing” in *chatta-vedikā*, *puṭa-vedikā* on the other hand certainly is a railing around the *stūpa* compared to a “packing” wrapped around goods.<sup>51</sup> The term *kucchivedikā* clearly designates a platform as confirmed by an episode told in the commentaries to the *Majjhimanikāya*, the *Papañcasūdanī*, and to the *Vibhaṅga*, the *Sammohavinodanī*. Both describe an anonymous Thera worshipping at the Mahācetiya (Mahāthūpa / Ruvanvāli-dāgoba):

... āgantvā pupphaparissāvanaṃ hatthe ṭhapetvā “pūjetha, bhante,”ti āha. thero “atimandāni no sāmaṇera pupphāni”ti āha. “gacchatha, bhante, bhagavato guṇe āvajjitvā pūjetha” ti.

thero pacchimamukhanissitena sopāṇena āruhya **kucchivedikā**bhūmiyaṃ pupphapūjaṃ kātuṃ āraddho. **vedikā**bhūmi paripuṇṇā. [so read] pupphāni patitvā **dutiya**bhūmiyaṃ jaṇṇupamāṇena odhinā pūrayiṃsu. tato otaritvā **pādapiṭṭhikapantiṃ** pūjesi. sā pi paripūri. paripuṇṇabhāvaṃ ñatvā **heṭṭhimatale** vikiranto agamāsi. sabbaṃ **cetiyaṅgaṇaṃ** paripūri. tasmīṃ paripuṇṇe “sāmaṇera pupphāni na khīyanti”ti āha. “parissāvanaṃ, bhante, adhomukhaṃ karoṭhā” ti. adhomukhaṃ katvā cālesi, tadā pupphāni khīṇāni, Ps III 245,21-246,8 = Vibh-a 293,2-14

“... he (the *sāmaṇera*) arrived, placed the water strainer full of flowers in the (Thera’s) hands and said: ‘Offer worship, venerable sir.’ The Thera said: ‘The flowers are too few for us.’ ‘Go, venerable sir, offer worship while reflecting of the qualities of the Lord.’ The Thera ascended by the stairway of the western entrance and began to make offering of flowers on the floor of the **platform surrounding the dome** (of the Cetiya). The floor of the platform was completely filled. The flowers fell down and filled the **second floor** knee-deep. Descending from there, he offered worship to the **line of feet** (??). That was also full. When he realized that it was full, he descended and proceeded while scattering (flowers) on the **lower-most floor**. The whole courtyard of the Cetiya was full. When this was completely full, he said: ‘*Sāmaṇera*, the flowers are not decreasing.’ ‘Turn the water strainer upside down, venerable sir.’ Turning it upside down, he shook it, then the flowers were gone” (after Ñāṇamoli, Vibh-a-trsl. with corrections).

This text clearly shows that *kucchivedikā* designates one or perhaps all elevated platforms immediately surrounding the dome of the Cetiya. They can be reached by stairs. The

<sup>51</sup>. Cf. also *jaṃghāpuṭāvedī*, Stūpal-k-v § 13, *jaṃghāyāḥ puṭāvedī jaṃghāpuṭāvedīti*, Stūpal-k-v § 16 and note 32 above.

*kucchivedikā* is the topmost platform above a second one (*dutiyabhūmi*) and below that is a third one, the *pādapiṭṭhipanti* of uncertain meaning.<sup>52</sup> After descending from this platform the lower most level is reached which is the *cetiyaṅgaṇa*. Thus there are three elevated platforms, on which the Thera could walk. The word *vedikā* here clearly indicates a “platform.” Moreover, it seems that all three platforms surrounding the dome can be called *kucchi-vedikā*.

This concurs with *mahācetiyaṣa samantā kucchivedikāya heṭṭhimabhāgato paṭṭhāya paññāyanaṭṭhāne*, Spk III 182,29 “within sight from all around the Mahācetiya starting from the lower most part of the platform around the dome.”

Flowers were showered by the Thera on three platforms and in the court yard in the middle of which the Cetiya stood. There is still another term for these platforms for which a translation as “railing” is excluded. When Duṭṭhagāmaṇī (101–77 / 161–137) built the Mahāthūpa, he had three platforms constructed called *pupphādhānas* originally made of bricks. The exceptionally large number of bricks needed for the platforms — one *koṭi* for one terrace is mentioned to underline this (Mhv XCXX 56) — shows that their extent was considerable. Nine times all three sank into the ground miraculously (Mhv XXX 52) to ensure the stability of the huge Cetiya.<sup>53</sup> When they were finally finished it is stated that *thūpe kammaṃ akārayi / pupphadhānesu dasasu iṭṭhakā dasakoṭiyo*, Mhv XXX 56 “he caused the work on the *thūpa* to be continued. For the ten (sets of three)<sup>54</sup> flower terraces ten *koṭis* of bricks (were used)” (W. Geiger). The same is described in a clearer wording in the *Thūpavaṃsa*: *dasa pupphadhānāni* [read *pupphādh-*°] *dasahi iṭṭhakākoṭihi niṭṭhānaṃ gamiṃsu*, Thūp (2) 231,34.

These terraces made of brick were soon replaced: *silāmayāni kāresi pupphādhānāni tīṇi so*, Mhv XXXIII 22 “(King Lañjatissa [59-50 / 119-110]) built three stone terraces for offerings of flowers” (W. Geiger). These three terraces (*pupphādhānas*) correspond to the three platforms, which were miraculously filled with flowers by the anonymous Thera mentioned in the commentaries to *Majjhimanikāya* and *Vibhaṅga* (see above). In terms of architecture, the highest of the three terraces or occasionally even all three terraces are called

<sup>52</sup> Usually *pāda-piṭṭhi* is the upper part of the foot in contrast to *pāda-tala* “sole.” Therefore a worship of Buddhapādas, which as footprints show the sole, is unlikely, though worship of (eight?) standing images seems possible, if the number 16 given in the following description of worshipping also at the Mahācetiya is compared: *mahācetiyaṃ padakkhiṇaṃ katvā soḷasasu pādapiṭṭhikāsu pañcapaṭiṭṭhitena vanditvā añjalim paggayha ullokeno buddhārammaṇaṃ pīṭim gahetvā tiṭṭhati*, As 72,36–73,1 “having circumambulated the Mahācetiya and bowed down in fivefold prostration at the 16 feet, he stood there looking up filled with joy reflecting on the Buddha.” The “16 feet” might be those of deities shown on the eight guard-stones on both sides of the four stairs leading from the courtyard to the lower terrace. However, the feet of these deities do not form a *pādapiṭṭhikapanti*; cf. also *āsanne pakatikathaṃ savanaṭṭhāne vanditukāmā pañcasatāni datvā labhanti, pādapiṭṭhikāsu sīsaṃ ṭhapetvā vanditukāmā sahasaṃ datvā labhanti, pādadhovana-udakaṃ patthayamānā dasasahassāni datvā labhanti*, Ps III 77,21–23. – This problem is neither noticed in Willem B. Bollée, “Traditionell-indische Vorstellungen über die Füße in Literatur und Kunst.” *Beiträge zur Allgemeinen und Vergleichenden Archäologie* 5. 1983, pp. 227–281 nor in the English version “Folklore on the Foot in Pre-modern India.” *IT* 34. 2008, pp. 39–145, which is published without the plates accompanying the earlier German version.

<sup>53</sup> This miracle may even mirror reality to a certain extent, if the Stūpa was built on the platform and not on the ground with the platform added later, cf. note 36 above. The platform may indeed have sunk under the weight of the dome. According to S. Paranavitana: *Stūpa*, as note 16 above, p. 15 there was no clear evidence available when he finished his book (1937) on whether or not the Stūpas were erected on the ground or on the platform in Ceylon.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. *niṭṭhitāpitamhi raññā tu pupphādhānattaye tadā*, ExtMhv XXX 154.

*kucchivedikā*, in terms of their function *pupphādhānas*. Moreover, given the size of the terraces, on which walking was easily possible and which were, moreover, accessible by stairs, the translation “ledge for laying down flowers” is hardly possible, nor is there any hint to “altars” for flower offerings.<sup>55</sup>

Lastly, the following paragraph shows that a *kucchi* as the dome of the Cetiya consists of bricks:

*dīghavāpicetiyamhi kira sudhākamme kayiramāne eko daharo muddhavedikāpādato pativā cetiyakucchiyā bhassati. heṭṭhā ṭhito bhikkhusaṅgho “dhajaggaparittam, āvuso, āvajjāhī”ti āha. so maraṇabhayena tājito “dhajaggaparittam maṃ rakkhātū”ti āha. tāvad ev’assa cetiyakucchito dve iṭṭhakā nikkhamitvā sopānaṃ hutvā aṭṭhaṃsu, upariṭṭhito vallinissenṇim otāresuṃ. tasmim nissenṇiyaṃ ṭhite iṭṭhakā yathāṭṭhāne yeva aṭṭhaṃsu, Spk I 341,27-342,7*

“When the Dīghavāpi-Cetiya was plastered, a boy fell from the base of the platform on the top and landed on the dome of the Cetiya. The monks standing on the ground said: ‘Think of the *Dhajaggaparitta*<sup>56</sup> my dear.’ Being afraid that he would die, he said: ‘May the *Dhajaggaparitta* protect me.’ At that very moment two bricks came out of the dome of the Cetiya and formed a step for him (i.e. one step for each foot). From above they lowered a rope (“creeper”) ladder. As soon as he stood on the rope ladder the bricks receded to their original position.”

The word *muddhavedikā* used in this story occurs occasionally,<sup>57</sup> mostly in a corrupted form. The only reference in a canonical text is found in *Apadāna* no. 143 *Vedikāraka-apadāna*, although it almost completely faded away from the printed editions. The PTS edition has:

*pasannacitto sumano buddhavedim akās’ ahaṃ, Ap 171,15*

with the variants *suddha-*<sup>o</sup> and, in the commentary, *mutta-*<sup>o</sup>. The latter is indeed the only form surviving in the *Apadāna*- and *Theragāthā*-texts in the *Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana* edition, where neither any variant is given nor is any trace of the original reading preserved. The commentary to the *Apadāna*, the *Visuddhajanaviḷāsini*, explains *dhātugabbhamhi muttavedim* [read *muddha-*<sup>o</sup>] *ahaṃ akāsin ti sambandho. pupphādhāratthāya pariyosāne vedikāvalayaṃ akāsim*, Ap-a 441,13f. (without any variant) “‘on the relic chamber I built a platform on the top,’ this is the syntactic connection. In the end I made a ring (around) the platform to hold flowers.” This “ring” is adorned by precious stones: *anekehi maṇīhi katavedikāvalayaṃ parivāretvā*, Ap-a 441,18 “... having covered the ring laid (around) the platform (on the top of a Stūpa) with various precious stones.”<sup>58</sup>

<sup>55</sup> W. Geiger: *Culture*, as note 44 above, § 85, p. 94. – In the *Extended Mahāvamsa pupphasanthara* once replaces *pupphādhāna*: *cināpetvā mahāthūpaṃ ekā iṭṭhikakoṭiyo / niṭṭhapetvāna pūjāya tayo te pupphasanthare*, ExtMhv XXX 136 foll.

<sup>56</sup> This is the *iti pi so*-formula, SN I 219,31-33, which is popular with Theravāda Buddhists until this very day, cf. O. v. Hinüber: *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin 1996 § 74.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. S. Paranavitana: *Stūpa*, as note 16 above, p. 31.

<sup>58</sup> In the *Mahāvamsa* this ring of precious stones called *vajiracumbaṭṭam*, Mhv XXXVI 66 “a precious ring of crystal” (W. Geiger) is mentioned in the same position and explained as *asaniuppadaṇḍaviddhamsanattham ādhāravalayaṃ iva*, Mhv-ṭ 666,7 “like a ‘supporting ring’ (? thus CPD) in order to destroy danger by lightening (i. e. a lightening conductor).” – The *vedikāvalaya* enclosing a building (*pāsāda*) seems to be different: (*pāsāde*) *caturo vedikā ti catūhi vedikāvalayehi jālakavāṭehi ca*, Ap-a 105,1 “four enclosures means with four rings of enclosures and with latticed doors,” cf. *nāṇājālakavāṭehi bahūhi vedikāhi ca*, Mhv LXXVIII 40 “with various latticed doors and many enclosures/terraces” also referring to a building.



The Thera is called Muttavedikatthera instead of Vedikāraka in both, the introduction and the colophon of the commentary, Ap-a 440,29; 441,21 with the variant Muddhavedikatthera listed in E° from the Sinhalese edition of Ap-a (SHB 1941) 376,14.39. This is indeed the only trace of the original *muddhavedikā*, because the text itself is already changed everywhere to *muttavedikaṃ*, Ap-a 441,31 (= SHB 376,31). Finally the text of this *Apadāna* as printed in the *Theragāthā* commentary (here attributed to the Thera Vijaya) reads:

*pasannacitto sumano ratanavedim akās' ahaṃ*, Th-a I 202,18\* (E° = S° [SHB]).

The non-metrical reading *ratana-vedi* is based on the commentary: *tassa thūpassa ratana-khacitaṃ vedikaṃ kāretvā*, Th-a I 202,5. Obviously the technical term *muddha-vedikā* “platform (or railing) on the top” was no longer known to or understood by the tradition and therefore replaced here by a railing of jewels (*ratana*) or pearls (*mutta* < *mukta*).

This is confirmed by various corruptions of *muddha-vedikā* when *mudd(h)a-°* is explained (and replaced?) by *hammiya-(vedikā)* in later Vinaya commentaries: *muddavedikā nāma cetiyassa hammiyavedikā*, Vjb 526,13; *muṇḍavedikāyā ti cetiyassa hammiyavedikāya. hammiyavedikā ti ca cetiyassa upari caturassavedikā* [so read] *vuccati*, Sp-ṭ III 401,14 foll. “a square platform on top of the Cetiya;” *muddavedikāyā ti cetiyassa hammiyavedikāya ghaṭākārassa upari caturassavedikāya*, Vmv II 241,9-11 “of the *hammiyavedikā* the square platform on top of the Cetiya in form of a pot;”<sup>59</sup> *cetiye sudhākammaṃ muṇḍavedikāya telamakkhanaṃ*, Pālim 285,12 [v. l. (Sinhalese mss.) *khuddakave-°*] “plastering on the Cetiya, moistening with oil of the *hammiyavedikā*” with the commentary *muṇḍavedikāyā iti cetiyassa hammiyavedikāya ghaṭākārassa upari caturassavedikāya*, Vinayālaṃkāra-ṭ II 45,12 foll. (quoted from Vmv).

The form *muṇḍa-vedikā* is probably influenced by definitions such as *hammiyā ti muṇḍacchadanagehā*, Nidd-a I 197,25 (v.l. *mudd(h)a-°* [!]) “*hammiyā* means a house on a building with a flat roof.” It is remarkable that two different forms, *mudda-°* and *muṇḍa-vedikā* are used by Sāriputta in his *Sāratthappakāsinī* and his *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchaya*. Although the *Vinayālaṃkāraṭīkā* quotes the explanation given in the *Vimatinodanī*, which reads *muddha-°*, it preserves the form *muṇḍa-°* in the *pratīka* quoted from the *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchaya*.

The term *hammiya* occurs in canonical Pāli only in an enumeration and designates as in Vedic Sanskrit a certain type of house *vihāraṃ vā aḍḍhayogaṃ vā pāsādaṃ vā hammiyaṃ vā guhaṃ vā*, Vin I 107,7 etc. “a dwelling place or a curved house or a long house or a mansion or a cave” (I. B. Horner), which is explained in the *Samantapāsādikā* by *pāsādo ti dīghapāsādo. hammiyan ti muṇḍacchadanapāsādo*, Sp 654,14 foll. “mansion means a long mansion; *hammiya* means a mansion with a flat roof;”<sup>60</sup> *hammiyan ti upariākāsatale patiṭṭhitakūṭāgāro pāsādo yeva*, Sp 1215,14 “*hammiya* is a mansion with a *kūṭāgāra* erected on top on the open-air terrace;” *hammiyagabbho ti ākāsatale kūṭāgāragabbho vā muṇḍacchadanagabbho vā*, Sp 1219,20 “room in a *hammiya* is either a room in a *kūṭāgāra* on the open-air terrace or a room on the flat roof.”

<sup>59</sup>. On this particular Stūpa see above note 16.

<sup>60</sup>. On the difficult meaning of *muṇḍa-°* in *muṇḍaharmmiya* etc. Seishi Karashima: *Die Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ. Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XIII.1. Tokyo 2012, § 13.9, note 2. The evidence from the *Arthaśāstra* is discussed by Patrick Olivelle: *King, Governance, and Law in Ancient India. Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra. A New Annotated Translation*. Oxford 2013, p. 504 on § 2.3.32.

The sub-commentaries add:

*ākāsatale ti hammiyatale*, Vjb 117,7;

*vihāro ti pākāraparicchinno sakalo āvāso. aḍḍhayogo ti dīghapāsādo. garuḷasaṇṭhānapāsādo ti pi vadanti. pāsādo ti caturassapāsādo. hammiyan ti muṇḍacchadanapāsādo. apare pana bhaṇanti “vihāro nāma dīghamukhapāsādo, aḍḍhayogo ekapassacchadanakasenāsanam, tassa kira ekapasse bhitti uccatarā hoti, itarapasse nīcā, tena taṃ ekapassacchadanakam hoti, pāsādo āyatacaturassapāsādo, hammiyam muṇḍacchadanam candikaṇḡaṇayuttan” ti*, Sp-ṭ III 235,1–7

“*vihāra* means the entire living place (for monks) surrounded by a wall; *aḍḍhayoga* means a long mansion, (some) say a mansion in the shape of a *garuḍa*;<sup>61</sup> *pāsāda* means square mansion; *hammiya* means a mansion with a flat roof. However, others say: *vihāra* is a mansion with a long access way;<sup>62</sup> *aḍḍhayoga* is a living place covered at one side. For its wall is higher on one side and low on the other, therefore it is covered on one side; *pāsāda* is a long square mansion; *hammiya* has a flat roof with an open space (for enjoying?) the moonlight;”

*pāsādo ti caturasso ucco anekabhūmakapāsādo. hammiyan ti muṇḍacchadano candikaṇḡaṇayutto nātiucco pāsādo*, Vmv II 104,27–105,2

“*pāsāda* is a square, high, multistoried mansion; *hammiya* is a not very high mansion with flat roof and an open space (for enjoying?) the moonlight.”

Although the original meaning of Skt. *harmya* or Pāli *hammiya* is clearly different from the one used in describing a Stūpa, the semantic development can be understood by looking at the superstructure of old Stūpas in Bharhut and elsewhere, which indeed have a small building within an enclosure standing on top of the dome.<sup>63</sup>

The term *harmikā* used in Buddhist Sanskrit for the top of the *cetiya* corresponds to Pāli *caturassacaya*, *muddhavedikā* or later *caturassakoṭṭhaka* in the language of the chronicles. Only *muddhavedikā* survives in the commentaries, but fell out of use later as the bad state of preservation of this word clearly indicates. For, ultimately the Sinhalese architects seem to have opted for *caturassakoṭṭhaka* surfacing in Pāli only once in the *Thūpavaṃsa* (13<sup>th</sup> century), but surviving in Sinhalese as *hatarās koṭuva*. Only at the time of the sub-commentaries to the Vinaya *hammiya-vedikā* intrudes into Pāli as a new, but as it seems, very short lived term used to explain *muddhavedikā*.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>61.</sup> On buildings in the shape of a *Guruḍa* see Acharya, *Encyclopedia*, as note 21 above, s. v. *garuḍa*.

<sup>62.</sup> The translation follows *dīghapamukham cetiya-gharam hoti*, Sp 748,16 discussed above p. 24 (O. v. Hinüber and P. Skilling, “An inscribed Kuṣāṇa Bodhisatva from Vādnagar”).

<sup>63.</sup> For an image from Bhārhut see A. K. Coomaraswamy: *Sculpture de Bharhut*, as note 15 above, planche VIII, fig. 24, planche XXV, fig. 65 = M. Bénisti, *Stylistics*, as note 11 above, Vol. II, plate XI, A or from Bhājā see A. L. Dallapiccola, “Stūpa,” as note 8 above, p. 38 figure 9.

<sup>64.</sup> The use of this new term may be due to influence from north India, see O. v. Hinüber: *Sprachentwicklung und Kulturgeschichte. Ein Beitrag zur materiellen Kultur des buddhistischen Klosterlebens*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Abhandlungen der sozial- und geisteswissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jg. 1992, no. 36, p. 74 foll., and “Zu einer Göttinger Dissertation über das buddhistische Recht.” *WZKS* 40. 1996, pp. 101–113 = *Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden 2009, pp. 233–245, particularly p. 112 = 244 on *khuddakasīmā*. – The conditions for an exchange of ideas between various Buddhist countries at the time are discussed by Tilman Frasch: “A Buddhist Network in the Bay of Bengal: Relations between Bodhgaya, Burma and Sri Lanka, c.

Finally, the table at the end shows the correspondences of technical terms discussed above according to the traditions of various Buddhist schools. The evidence for the Lokottaravāda(?) terminology is based on Prak-c-I quoted in Stūpal-k-v,<sup>65</sup> which corresponds to *Kriyāsaṃgraha* II and that for the Mūlasarvāstivādins on the *Divyāvadāna* as well as Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra*. That only *pratikaṇṭhukā* without the corresponding *kaṇṭhaka* "drum, wall" is attested in the Mūlasarvāstivāda texts may be purely accidental given the very slim evidence available.<sup>66</sup>

However, in spite of the dearth of material, architectural terminology proves to be clearly different in various Buddhist schools, which can be observed best in the designation of the dome of the Stūpa by *kucchi* / *udara* / *thūpa* in Theravāda in contrast to *kaṇṭhaka* in Lokottaravāda and *aṇḍa* in Mūlasarvāstivāda texts. Therefore, the language of the architects is yet another tool, which can, if used with the necessary circumspection and caution, help to distinguish texts of one school from that of another.<sup>67</sup>

Theravāda /Theriya	Lokottaravāda	Mūlasarvāstivāda
- - -		prati-kaṇṭhukā
vedikā 1, 2 (kucchivedikā / pupphādāna)	vedikā 1 to 3	jagatī 1-4 / medhī
pādavedikā / kucchivedikā	jaṅghāvedikā	jaṅghāvedikā
	kaṇṭhaka	
pupphādāna	puṣṭagrahaṇī	- - -
- - -	kaṇṭhaka	- - -
udara / thūpa / kucchi		aṇḍa
caturassacaya /caturassakoṭṭhaka / hammiya(vedikā)	harmikā	harmikā

Abbreviations follow the system laid down in Helmer Smith: *Epilegomena to Volume I of V. Trenckner: A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Copenhagen, 1948.

300–1300,” in Claude Guillot, Denys Lombard & Roderich Ptak (eds.): *From the Mediterranean to the China Sea; Miscellaneous Notes*. South China and Maritime Asia Volume 7. Wiesbaden 1998, pp. 69–92, particularly pp. 77, 85.

<sup>65</sup> The school affiliation is not beyond doubt according to J. W. de Jong *IIJ* 38. 1995, p. 194.

<sup>66</sup> The term *kumbha* used in *Kriyāsaṃgraha* I seems to belong to the language of architects and as such does not relate to any Buddhist school.

<sup>67</sup> Other distinctive features are the Vinaya terminology, style, formulas and literary form, see O. v. Hinüber: *Entstehung und Aufbau der Jātaka-Sammlung*. Akademie ..., as note 64 above, Jg.1998, no.7, p. 210.